In re Appln. of Rosseau et al. Application No. 10/805,939 Amendment in Response to Final Office Action of January 10, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings

The two attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1, 2 and 2A. These sheets replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1, 2 and 2A.

In FIG. 1, two instances of reference number "60" have been deleted so that FIG. 1 better corresponds with FIG. 2. In FIG. 2, illustration of one of the slidable gates 85 has been amended to show the element being slidable for allowing or restricting airflow from the base 20 to one or more of the tubular members 30 (FIG. 1). Furthermore, in FIG. 2, reference number "95" has been added to correspond with an amendment to paragraph 0035 of the specification relative to the ionized air source. FIG. 2A has been amended to correct the reference number "90" in the left-hand portion of the figure to be "90b" for consistency with the specification. The foregoing amendments to FIGS. 1, 2 and 2A are fully supported by the as-filed specification and no new matter is introduced.

Attachments: Two Replacement Sheets (FIGS. 1, 2 and 2A)

In re Appln. of Rosseau et al. Application No. 10/805,939 Amendment in Response to Final Office Action of January 10, 2006

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action of January 10, 2006. Claims 1-35 are pending at the time of the Office Action, which was made Final.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as obvious over Collier (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,711) in view of Leamon, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,687). Claims 3 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Collier in view of Leamon, Jr. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Lancer (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194746). Claims 10, 12, 14, 18 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 25-34 are indicated as being allowed.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). To address this objection, Applicants submit herewith two sheets of replacement drawings in which FIGS. 1, 2 and 2A have been amended. The replacement drawings are fully supported by the as-filed specification and introduce no new matter. FIGS. 1 and 2A have been amended to correct errors with labeling of various illustrated elements and for consistency with the written specification. FIG. 2 has been amended illustrate the slidable gates 85 and the ionized air source 95, which was previously illustrated but unlabeled. Applicants respectfully request that the replacement drawings be accepted and the objection withdrawn.

Applicants disagree with the basis for the standing rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Nevertheless, to expedite issuance of a patent, the Applicants merely submit the instant amendment to place the application in form for allowance. By way of the instant amendment, claims 1 and 15 are canceled without prejudice, claims 2-14, 16-22 and 24 are amended, and claims 35-61 are introduced. The claim amendments and new claims are fully supported by the as-filed specification and introduce no new matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuing application.

As suggested by the Office Action, claims 10, 12, 14, 18 and 21 have been rewritten in independent form and are believed to be allowable based on the Office Action's indication of these claims including allowable subject matter. Claims 2-9, 11 and 13 have been amended to depend from claim 10 and are believed to be allowable as well. New claims 35-

In re Appln. of Rosseau et al. Application No. 10/805,939 Amendment in Response to Final Office Action of January 10, 2006

44 generally duplicate dependent claims 2-9, 11 and 13, depending from claim 12. Thus, new claims 35-44 are believed to be allowable. Similarly, new claims 45-54 generally duplicate dependent claims 2-9, 11 and 13 (as well as new claims 35-44), depending from claim 14. Thus, new claims 45-54 are believed to be allowable. Claims 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22-24 have been amended to depend from claim 18 and are believed to be allowable. New claims 55-61 generally duplicate claims 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22-24, depending from claim 21. Thus, new claims 55-61 are believed to be allowable.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian C. Rupp, Reg No. 35,665

GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP

191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700 Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698

(312) 569-1000 (telephone)

(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)

Customer No.: 08968

CH02/22446170.1

Date: May 4, 2006